

# Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program

## Summary of 2003 Portfolio Strengths and Weaknesses

### World Languages

**Category 1.0 – Instructional Design:** How well does the teacher design a portfolio unit that enables students to explore world language concepts as they develop linguistic proficiency and cultural understanding?

| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>High Quality Portfolios</b></p> <p>In general, high quality world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:</p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Less Developed Portfolios</b></p> <p>In general, less developed world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:</p>   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The portfolio unit focused on the integration of language development and student-to-student communication within an overarching cultural context.</li> <li>• The teacher selected a variety of appropriate activities, authentic materials and learning tasks to integrate language proficiency with cultural understanding.</li> <li>• The quality and sequence of the learning activities showed consistent accommodations for students' individual learning needs and interests</li> <li>• The unit included appropriate resources, including authentic materials, to develop students' linguistic and cultural competence. The teacher's choices addressed students' learning styles.</li> <li>• The teacher designed activities at the appropriate level of difficulty for their students' abilities as well as language and cultural experiences.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The portfolio unit focused mainly on language development</li> <li>• The teacher selected activities, materials, and learning tasks that limited opportunities for students' development of language skills and cultural knowledge.</li> <li>• The quality and sequence of learning activities showed limited or no accommodations for students' learning needs.</li> <li>• The portfolio lacked a variety of resources, including authentic materials.</li> <li>• There was limited evidence that the teacher took into consideration the students' previous language and cultural experiences when designing their activities.</li> <li>• The teacher provided little or no evidence of a cultural context in the unit. The unit was based on vocabulary or grammar.</li> </ul> |

## World Languages (continued)

**Category 2.0 – Instructional Implementation:** How well does the teacher model language and culture and facilitate student performance throughout the learning process?

| <b>High Quality Portfolios</b><br><br>In general, high quality world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:   | <b>Less Developed Portfolios</b><br><br>In general, less developed world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The teacher established the world language as the exclusive medium of communication. The interaction between students and teacher and among students occurred in the world language.</li><li>• Students communicated with one another exclusive in the world language as they explored the cultural context of the unit.</li><li>• The teacher established and maintained a learning environment that provided a cultural context and examples of the products, practices, and perspectives of the culture.</li><li>• The teacher created a supportive learning environment where students were encouraged to actively participate, take risks, and use language in creative conversations.</li><li>• The teacher demonstrated an understanding of the dual roles of modeling language and structuring learning (instructor) and supporting student-to-student communication (facilitator).</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The teacher used the target language as a medium of communication in isolated segments of instruction. Students used words or limited phrases in the language, mostly in response to teacher-directed questions.</li><li>• The teacher displayed significant language inaccuracies.</li><li>• Students had few or no opportunities to communicate with one another and with the teacher in the world language.</li><li>• The teacher established a learning environment with limited cultural context. The teacher made little or no reference to products, practices, or perspectives of the culture studied.</li><li>• The teacher did not create a supportive learning environment that fostered active participation.</li><li>• The teacher did not provide evidence of understanding the dual roles of instructor and facilitator. While there was evidence of instruction, often the interaction between and among students in the world language was missing.</li></ul> |

## World Languages (continued)

**Category 3.0 – Assessment of Learning:** How well does the teacher design, use and interpret assessments of student progress throughout the portfolio unit?

| <b>High Quality Portfolios</b>  | <b>Less Developed Portfolios</b>   |
|---|--|
| In general, high quality world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:   | In general, less developed world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The teacher consistently monitored and supported students’ linguistic and cultural competence through a variety of methods and made appropriate adjustments to further class and individual learning.</li><li>• Assessments focused on measuring language skills and conceptual understanding within a cultural context.</li><li>• All assessment criteria were clear, linked to lesson objectives, and consistently applied in the evaluation of student work.</li><li>• The feedback provided to students included specific comments based on the analysis of strengths and weaknesses in student work, as well as formative recommendations for progress in future learning.</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• During the unit the teacher monitored student learning primarily through observations and made few or no instructional adjustments.</li><li>• Assessments focused on recall of isolated words, phrases and cultural facts.</li><li>• Assessment criteria were missing, unclear or unrelated to the unit’s main objectives.</li><li>• Assessment criteria were inconsistently applied in the evaluation of student work.</li><li>• The feedback to students was inaccurate, limited or vague. Brief comments (“Good!”, “Nice job!”) or numerical scores did nothing to support students in future learning.</li></ul> |

## World Languages (continued)

**Category 4.0 – Analysis of Learning and Teaching:** How well does the teacher analyze his/her teaching and professional growth based on documented student performance?

| <b>High Quality Portfolios</b>  | <b>Less Developed Portfolios</b>   |
|---|--|
| In general, high quality world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:   | In general, less developed world language portfolios tend to exhibit the following characteristics:  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The teacher’s analysis of student learning focused on developing language skills to communicate independently within a cultural context, and the conclusions were supported by specific examples from student work in the unit.</li><li>• The reflective commentary on teaching identified specific connections between teaching practices and students’ learning outcomes, supported by evidence from the portfolio.</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The teacher’s analysis of student learning was limited and vague. Comments about student learning focused mainly on the general acquisition of basic language skills and cultural knowledge.</li><li>• There was minimal analysis of student work in the portfolio, and few specific references were made to samples of student work.</li><li>• The reflective commentary on teaching identified limited connections between teaching language and culture and students’ learning outcomes.</li><li>• The analysis of student learning often focused on students’ behavior and study habits.</li><li>• The teacher provided limited analysis of teaching and student learning in either the daily logs or other commentaries. Where there was reflection, there was little or no specific reference to effective teaching strategies in the unit that promoted student learning.</li></ul> |